Remarks

Reconsideration and reexamination of the above-identified patent application, as amended, are respectfully requested. Claim 18 has been amended. No claims have been cancelled, withdrawn, or added. Accordingly, claims 1-20 are pending in this application upon

entry of this Amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 18 was rejected based on 35 U.S.C. § 112 as having insufficient

antecedent basis for the limitation "LF command signal." In response, Applicants have

amended claim 18 and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 3-9 and 11-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being

unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,745,624 issued to Porter et al. ("Porter") in view of U.S.

Patent Publication No. 2003/0129949 to Selektor ("Selektor"). Claims 2, 10 and 17-20 were

rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Porter in view of Selektor and

further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,612,671 issued to Mendez et al. ("Mendez").

Independent claim 1 recites, among other limitations, "an immobilizer

transmitter that transmits at least one low frequency (LF) sensor diagnostic signal "

Neither Porter nor Selektor teach an immobilizer transmitter that transmits at least one low

frequency sensor diagnostic signal.

In fact, the Examiner concedes that Porter does not disclose a low frequency

diagnostic signal. (Office Action, p. 4) Porter discloses transmitting a calibration signal 34.

According to Porter, the calibration signal merely includes a serial number 60. (Col. 4, lines

26-33) Porter further discloses that a controller 16 receives the serial number and

-6-

S/N: 10/697,742

Reply to Office Action of March 17, 2005

"[A]ssociates the serial number with a tire location of the vehicle." (Abstract) Thus, not only does Porter not disclose a low frequency signal, Porter does not disclose a *diagnostic* signal. Applicants state that Porter discloses calibrating a tire pressure system through determining the location of a tire on a vehicle wherein a *calibration* signal (as opposed to a diagnostic signal) is transmitted.

The Examiner however suggests that Selektor discloses transmitting a low frequency signal. However, the low frequency signal of Selektor is not a diagnostic signal but rather a *synchronization* signal. Selektor limits the use and/or application of the synchronization signal by stating that the "[L]ow frequency (LF) signals are used for *specific* communications between the signaling device 24 and the controller 26" Selektor further teaches that those specific communications include the low frequency signals "[F]or transmitting . . . synchronization counter values across [a] bi-directional communication link." ([0017] and Abstract; emphasis added) Selektor continues with a detailed description of a "secure strategy for sharing synchronization counter information." ([0021]) Accordingly, Selektor does not disclose transmitting at least one low frequency sensor *diagnostic* signal as recited in independent claim 1. Thus, the addition of Selektor does not cure the deficiencies of Porter.

As such, there is neither motivation nor suggestion to combine or modify the references to render independent claim 1 obvious. Applicants state that independent claim 1 is patentable over the cited art and respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection. Additionally, for at least the foregoing reasons, independent claims 9 and 17 are likewise patentable over the cited art. Thus, dependent claims 2-8, 10-16, and 18-20 which depend from independent claims 1, 9, and 17 are likewise patentable over the cited art.

Atty Dkt No. LEAR 04104 PUS

S/N: 10/697,742

Reply to Office Action of March 17, 2005

CONCLUSION

In summary, claims 1-20 meet the substantive requirements for patentability. The case is in appropriate condition for allowance. Accordingly, such action is respectfully requested. If a telephone or video conference would expedite allowance or resolve any further questions, such a conference is invited at the convenience of the Examiner.

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas J. Lemense, et al.

Myron J. Lloyd

Reg. No. 53,228

Attorney/Agent for Applicant

Date: June 10, 2005

BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.

1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor Southfield, MI 48075-1238

Phone: 248-358-4400 Fax: 248-358-3351